G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1904-05
(Muzrai)

File No. 121.

Serial Nos. 1-18

Papers Filed.

Month June 1908.

SUBJECT.

File relating to the alienation of the Inam Lands to the Sri Venugopala Sawmy & Sri Anjaneyas at Thayoor Village in Nanjanagood Taluk and sanctioning the scale of Expenditure to be the above Temples.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES

LATER REFERENCES

[illegible] 542 - 3 86. 1

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

OFFICE NOTE

File No. 121-04

SUBJECT.

Alienation of the Inam lands endowed to the Anjaneyaswami temple at Tagur and the removal of the Archak.

From

The Secretary to Government, General & Revenue Departments.

No. R 1347/559 Dated 29th July 1905

The Anjaneya and Venu Gopala-swami temples at Tagur in the Nanjangud Taluk are Muzrai Institutions enjoying Inam lands and a small cash grant. The details of the Inam lands are given in the Extract from the Inam Register dated 1st December 1880, from which it is observed that the said lands were confirmed as Devadaya Inam by the Inam Department for Paditara

Slip A

and Deeparadhana in the temples.
The total extent of the lands
consisting of 11 Survey numbers
is 5-8 Acres 6 Guntas with an assessment
of Rs 64-8-0. All the 11 numbers
were originally dry but 2 of them
were converted into wet after the
introduction of the Hullahalli Channel
Siddamallappa and 17 others were
enjoying the lands paying Kandayam
to the Archak -

2. Venkatakrishnachar, the
Archak of the temples, presented
a petition to the Amildar on the
22nd December 1898, praying that
the wet land in the enjoyment of
Siddamallappa, one of the cultivators
of the Devadaya Inam lands
might be resumed from him and
restored to the Institution for its
In the course of local

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

local enquiry held by the Amildars Messrs C. D. Ramaswamayya and M. G. Krishnaswami Rao, it was ascertained that the cultivators were enjoying the lands as if they were their own private property, paying only the assessment; that the temples were deriving no benefit from them; and that the buildings were in a state of disrepair. The Acting Amildar Mr C. Venkat Rao thereupon recommended their resumption under Clause B of the alienation Rules of 1877 and this recommendation was accordingly approved by the Asst Commr Mr C. B. Seshagiri Rao, who issued an order of resumption on the 1st August 1902 under the Rules quoted above

Slip C

Slip B

No 19 dated 1st August 1902

Slip C.

Signed by Mr Seshagiri Rao as "For Dy Commr"

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-04. 3

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

3. The cultivators, represented by Advocate Mr H. Narasinga Rao, appealed to the Dy Comr. On the 6th May 1903 against Mr C. B. Seshagiri Rao's order, the chief appeal grounds being that they had been enjoying the lands from a long time, paying Kandayam to the Archak and that they could not be deprived of their [illegible] hak. They however stated that they were willing to pay the Kandayam fixed at the Survey Settlement. In support of their contention they produced chiefly two documents — one being a copy of the list prepared in 1855 — Slip D

shewing the names of the cultivators, who then held the temple lands, and the other being a registered document — Dated 3-12-1892 Slip E.

(Sale Deed) in original executed by one

(who was previously

previously cultivating the land) in favour of Siddamallappa (one of the appellants) selling a portion of the temple land for Rs (200).

4 In disposing of the appeal, the Dy Comr, Mr Kantaraja Urs, observed that "the appellants were at best tenants at will" and that "their long enjoyment of the land, which was unauthorized from the beginning, could give them no manner of hak to claim the lands in question as their own". As regards the sale Deed it was found out that it had been written by the Respondent himself (Anchak Venkatakrishnaiah). In these circumstances the Dy Comr held that

Slip E

Vide his order dated 20th August 1904 Slip F

neither the Archak nor the tenants were competent to alienate these unenfranchised Inams and accordingly confirmed the order of the Asst Comr Mr C. B. Seshagiri Rao and dismissed the Appeal, calling for a report from the Amildar at the same time to report the exact amount due to the temple from each one of the Appellants by way of Survey assessment, since the Survey Settlement. He at the same time directed that the ~~st~~ Amildar should "select a more deserving man than the Respondent for the Archak's place".

5. Against the foregoing order of the Dy Commissioner two Appeal petitions have been received

received :—

Slip G. (i) From Sivakamallappa and 17 other cultivators — dated 1st February 1905, addressed to the Secretary to Govt., General & Revenue Department

Slip H. (ii) From Venkata Krishnaiah Naidu — dated 17th April 1905 addressed to the Secretary to Govt., Muzrai Department.

6. The Appellants no (i) contend that they are not tenants at-will but that they are Kadim tenants; and that the Rules of 1877 quoted in the Dy Comr's order does not apply to the present case — while transferring this petition to the Muzrai Secretariat for

the General & Revenue Secretariat has pointed out in their Office-note, that ~~the~~ in a similar case it was held that the case was not one for the Council Committee "being a dispute between a land-lord (Govt) and a tenant", and that it was accordingly transferred to the Muzrai Dept for disposal

Slip 9

7. The precedent quoted by the General & Revenue Secretariat is put up (vide linked File). It will be seen ~~therefrom~~ from the order therein issued from the Muz: Secretariat, that one Ithadi Basavaraja Urs, who was in the enjoyment of an Inam land belonging to the Anjaneyaswami temple at Marur in the Arkalgud ~~was~~ was evicted from the

Slip 9

land

land when he failed to pay an increased amount to the temple as agreed to by him —

8. The contention of the Appellant no (ii) viz Anchak Venkatakrishnachar, is that at the time when the sale deed was written by him on behalf of the executor Sivanagga, he did not know that ~~the~~ Devadaya and Brahmadaya lands were not subject to alienation; and that if he had connived at the sale he would not have himself complained of the alienation as was done in the present case — He also states that since the introduction of the Survey Settlement, he did not pay the

and that he incurred all the expenses in the temple from his private money, in addition to paying the contribution and water-rate.

9. The records connected with both the appeals have been received from the Dy. Commr., from which it will be seen that three questions are involved in this case viz:—

(i) Regarding the alienation of an Inam land by one of the cultivators'

(ii) The eviction of the present cultivators who contend that they are Kadim tenants

& (iii) The removal of the Archak for having

having commented at the alienation of the temple land as observed by the Dy Commissioner

Submitted for orders

hs
21/8/05

Muzrai Secretary's Remarks.

As regards the question of the alienation of the temple lands and the eviction of the present cultivators:-

Slip. E.

It is observed from the Sale Deed executed on the 3rd December 1892 by one Sivanaya in favour of Sidda Mallappa Setty, one of the Appellants, that half of the Survey No. 25, assessed at 14 as, belonging to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple had been already sold by the same person to the same individual on the 16th November 1888 and that the remaining half was sold in December 1892 for Rs 200/-. From the statements given by the other cultivators

before the Amildar during his enquiry in April 1904, it is also clear that they were paying an inadequate amount to the Pujari on the alleged ground that the lands had been purchased by them from the previous cultivators. What right Sivanaiya had and other cultivators to sell the Devadaya Inam lands is not clear and the contention of the Appellants that they are Kadim tenants is not tenable as they held the lands unauthorizedly. The Deputy Commissioner's Order in the matter of applying the Alienation Rules of 1877 to these lands may therefore be upheld, option being however given to the present cultivators to retain the lands on payment of such reasonable gutta as may be offered by others. In a similar case, the holder of the temple inam land in the Arakalgud Taluk was required to pay over and above the Survery Assessment. The File on the subject is herewith submitted for reference.

Sri Anjaneya temple at Marur, Arkalgud Tk.

As regards the removal of the Archak Venkatakrishnachar ordered by the Deputy Commissioner for having himself written the sale deed of 1892 referred to above, I am of the humble opinion that dismissal

from the [illegible] appointment in this case seems to be too severe a punishment. The Archak states in his appeal petition that, as the Shanbhogue of the village had written the first document selling one-half of the portion of the land in question in 1888, he was led to believe that the Devadaya lands were alienable and accordingly wrote the Sale Deed himself in respect of the other half on behalf of the executor. He may ~~however~~ be warned this time.

With a view to have a proper check over the income and expenditure of the temple, a regular scale of expenditure may be fixed with reference to the income from the inam lands and the Archak required to submit the accounts periodically to the Taluk Cutcherry.

As the temple is reported to be in a state of disrepair, the Archak may be required to execute the necessary repairs within 6 months with a warning that all the Inam lands

14

File No. of 190 Muzrai·Secretariat.

attached in case of his failure.

A draft Order is submitted for approval.

Submitted to the Dewan

thro' the II Councillor. } [illegible]

8th January 1906.

Camp Theerthahalli.

I quite agree with the Secy in the opinion above expressed. Draft may issue.

[illegible] 12/1/06.

155
12-1-06.

[illegible] 15/1/06

10801
16.1.06

Appd by the Dewan
Issue [illegible] 19/1/06

G R.S 11]

1905.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Rev. Ins)

1 5

NOTES.

File No 624-04

FILE HEADING

Appeal of Siddamallappa & others of Tayur, Nanjangud Tk in re-their removal from the tenancy of the Inam lands attached to the Anjaneya & Venugopalaswami temples in the said village

From

Siddamallappa & others of Tayur, Nanjangud Tk..

No.	Dated	Received 22-2-05	
Diary Nos 6219 & 6220	Enclos 3	Spare Copies	Serial No 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appellant) Explain the delay in appealing as being due to ignorance misrepresentation & domestic inconvenience. They also state (Diary No 6220) that as Siddamallappa is the chief man they will be bound by all what he does.

NOTES AND ORDERS

This is a complaint from the tenants of certain lands belonging to a Inugran Institution in re-their removal from the tenancy of the said lands.

It has been held in a similar case, the facts

Notes—First sheet

MGCPB—25 000—18 8-06

G.R.S. 12|
General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No 16 of 190

Serial
No.

of which, are contained in the Dy Comr's letter, that the case was not one for the Council Committee being a dispute between a landlord (Govt) & a tenant. The case was accordingly sent to the Mayran Secretary for disposal. This may be sent to the Mwz Secy for disposal

Sub-d
SP 24/2/05
G 24/2

R
24/2/05
G 24/2

No. R 7683
Mis. 624-04-1 Forwarded to the Secy. in the
Dy 27-2-05 Moozroy Deptt 25-2-1905

[signature]
Secy. in the G & R Deptt

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3252

Norr—Contn sheet

MGCPB—20 000—1-11-01

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Note continued

Orders were accordingly issued and the substance thereof was communicated to the parties concerned.

Petition no 4551 Dy 1st April 1907

Sidda mallappa has appealed to Govt. praying for a re-consideration of the foregoing orders of Govt. He lays stress on the fact that he did not give a statement as mentioned in the endorsement issued to him, to the effect that inadequate amount was being paid to the Pujari on the ground ~~on the ground~~ that lands had been purchased by ~~them~~ him from the previous cultivators and complains of a failure of justice. He prays that ~~his possession of~~ the lands may ~~not be disturbed~~ be

Submitted } continued to him on payment of the Survey Assessment

[signature] 11/5/07

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

The appellant may be heard by the 2d Councillor on some date in July after returning from Mysore.

Subd to no 2d (?) 4/7

Kilinatulamiyo
11/6/07

A date may be fixed for hearing the case BVR
12/6/07

Fix Tuesday the 16th July/07 & issue notices
12/6/07

Dft Submtd.
14/6/07

The case was heard by the 2d Councillor yesterday.
Issue the draft which has been appd by the Councillor
17/7/07

Note continued.

In the Draft approved by the Council, it was stated that there were no grounds to reconsider the Govt Order resuming the ~~[illegible]~~ lands from the possession of Sidda Mallappa and restoring them to the Sri Anjaneya and the Sri Venugopalaswami temples at Jayu in the Nanjangud Taluk. It was at the same time observed that, in consideration of the fact that the appellant Sidda Mallappa might have incurred some outlay on the improvement of the land in question, it seemed equitable to lease out the land to him on a somewhat reduced patta; but that what reduction could reasonably be made had to be decided on knowing the approximate expenditure incurred by him on the land after it came his possession from Sivanayya. The Deputy Commissioner was therefore requested to furnish information on this point, and to also to

18.

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

Govt with his opinion as to whether the present lessee Nanjappa to whom the land had been already leased out for Rs 55/- for a period of 5 years, could be disturbed now with a view to re-transfer the lease to Sidda Mallappa for the same period and if so, what reduced gutta may be ight be accepted from him.

The Deputy Commissioner's reply has now been received. The Amildar reports that the Panchayetdars estimate the expenditure incurred by Sidda Mallappa for improving the land at Rs 25/- but that it is not now possible to ascertain exactly the extent of the improvements effected by him a number of years previously. He further states that the present lessee Nanjappa who is the nephew of Sidda Mallappa is only the nominal guttedar the actual cultivator being only Sidda Mallappa, and that therefore there will be no objection to re-transfer the lease to the latter. He adds that calculating the

from the land to be 39 pallas and at Rs 4/- per palla

and after deducting therefrom one-half of the produce due as the temples' share and also the gutta of Rs 55/- as now fixed, the balance of Rs 23/- goes to the cultivator as a clear profit to him, and that the 'ore the gutta of Rs 55/- is reasonable. The Deputy Commissioner however states that Sidda Mallappa having appropriated to himself the income from the land during the time it was in his possession, paying only the Kandayam to the temple Archak, anything less than 25 pallas per year would not be a fair gutta.

With reference to Govt Pro: No. 3118, dated 23rd January 1906, directing that the repairs to the temples should be got done by ~~the Archak~~ Venkataramanaghar, the newly installed Archak of the temples, the Amildar reports that the said Archak pleads inability to do so, as the repairs are estimated to cost Rs 5 or 6 hundred, but that if either the arrears of produce of all

20

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

or the Kandayam is paid to him, he would himself contribute to [illegible] up the necessary amount of the estimate, and complete the repairs within 3 months thereafter by Govt. The Amildar, in recommending the Archak's prayer, states that as the cultivators of the lands were declined by Govt. to be recognised as Kadim tenants it is not possible to ascertain from them what particular crop and how much was harvested every year, and recommends that only the arrears of Kandayam ~~[illegible]~~ which amount to Rs 451-15-7 may be recovered from those from whom they are due. The Amildar also submits a scale of expenditure ~~to be~~ for the two temples taking their present receipts viz Rs 144-14-6 into consideration. The Deputy Commissioner expresses the opinion that the proposals of the Amildar are reasonable and solicits the sanction of Govt therefor.

Submitted with a draft for approval

[illegible] 17.12.07

[illegible] 5/1/08

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Note continued.

In the draft, approved, certain further information was called for from the Deputy Commissioner. It has now been furnished under cover of the Deputy Commissioner's letter now under disposal. ~~[illegible]~~

A draft is submitted dealing with the facts of the case in detail.

Sub^d.) to the 2^d (^r.)

[illegible] 13/6/08

[illegible] 13/6/08

Thiru Salam Bhat 13/6/08

Approved [illegible] 15/6/08

[illegible] Draft [illegible] 15/6/08

[illegible] No. 485 [illegible] 13th May 1908

543 / 13-6-08

790 / 15-6-08

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05

5742
1/21

32
ಶಿಷ್ಟಮಲ್ಲಿಪ್ಪ ೧೯
1-2-95
[illegible]

R.M.H. No. 624-04.
Sl. No. 1.

Sl

To

The Secretary to the Govt of
His Highness the Maharajah
of Mysore & Revenue Genl Dept

The humble petition of Siddla
Mallappa & 170 others, Appellants
in Mayoryellis appeal No. 1 of
1902/3. on the file of the Court of the Deputy
Commissioner, Mysore District.

Humbly Sheweth.

That the Appellants are Kadeem
tenants holding the lands by themselves & predecessors in title for more than 100 years.

Branch I
6

2. The liability of the Appellants is to pay the Kunlogeen fixed at the Survey settlement.

Secretary
3.2.05
[illegible]
37

3 That the Appellants have agreed to pay the Kunlogeen fixed by the Survey settlement Officers & to that effect they have given statements to the Amildar

C.C.
6
E 3/2

4 That the Appellants No. 1, 2

never claimed proprietary rights to the lands & this claim is only the permanent right of occupancy paying the Kundoyem.

5. The Archika claims more than the Kundoyem fixed by the Survey Settlement or in default the lands - to either of which he is not entitled.

6. That the Kundoyem paid by the Appellants for the lands before settlement was 6 pagodas & the Kundoyem paid after the settlement is ~~Rs~~ 64/.

7. That the Appellants are not responsible for the act of Respondent Archika & they cannot be deprived of the permanent holdings for any acts of Archika.

8 That the Archika has been removed & the Appellants cannot be further punished.

9. That the lands contended to be

the Inam lands attached to the Temple & they are not converted to any other purpose.

10. That the Appellants did not question the proprietory right of the temple to the lands - The Putta stands in the name of the temple, the Condoyem fixed on the lands is agreed to be paid by the Appellants for the temple & they have been paying to the Archeka according to Mamool -

11 The Appellants are prepared to pay Kundoyem to Taluq Cutcherry if so directed -

12 The Appellants are not tenants at will but they are Kadeem tenants

13. The Notification No 266, dated 17th November 1877 quoted in the order does not apply to the present case as the lands are not converted to any other purpose than the purpose for which the lands were orig

given & the lands have been in possession of the Appellants & their predecessors in title for more than 100 years

14 The Deputy Commissioner has not considered the papers mentioned in the list Exhibit A.

15 The Deputy Commissioner order is illegal & opposed to the facts of the case.

15 The 1st Appellant has improved the land in his holding at a cost of 800 Rs & converted the land from dry to wet cultivation

The Petitioners humbly pray the Government to set aside the order of the Deputy Commissioner & order the stay of enforcement of the Deputy Commissioner order pending the final order of the Government

[illegible]

Petty B. Land Secretary.

[illegible]

నోటీసు

సంబంధము కాల్వలు తీయుట గురించి

కాంబూరు గ్రామ దాంతర్గత 2 నెంబరు పట్టాదారులు వరి సంవత్సరం దక్షిణం వరకు

కాంబూరు గ్రామ దక్షిణం వంపనేలలో నీటి సంబంధమైన కాల్వ కొరకు ఈ క్రింద పేర్కొనబడిన సర్వేనంబరులలో కాల్వలు తీయవలసియున్నందున మార్గ

సర్వేనంబరు	యకరాలు	ఆకరాలు	మార్గ వివరము
89	5-33	5-8-0	కాంబూరు గ్రామ పరిధిలో ఉన్న పొలాలు
130	5-22	6-0-0	యాదవరెడ్డి గారి పొలాలు
156	7-32	6-0-0	చెరువు ఆక్రమించి నిర్మించిన భవనం
161	3-0	2-0-0	పంచాయితీ వారి పశువుల పాకలు
164	7-13	5-0-0	పంచాయితీ వారి పంటపొలాలు
165	6-37	5-0-0	
167	4-12	3-0-0	మేడా కొత్తపల్లి వారి పొలాలు
174	6-15	4-8-0	పర్యారపు ఆక్రమణలో ఉన్నవి
175	6-34	6-8-0	తిమ్మపురి గ్రామ పరిధిలో ఉన్నవి
418	2-0	10-0-0	ఉపకాలువ కోసం నోటీసు పంపబడినది
419	2-8-	11-0-0	
	586	64-8-0	

కాబట్టి పై పేర్కొనబడిన సర్వేనంబరులలో కాల్వలు తీయవలసియున్నందున ఆ సర్వేనంబరులలో నివసించు రైతులు తమ తమ పొలాలలో కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడకుండా సహకరించగలరు. లేనట్లయితే కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడినట్లయితే వారి పేరుమీద కేసు నమోదు చేయబడును.

కాబట్టి పై పేర్కొనబడిన సర్వేనంబరులలో నివసించు రైతులు తమ తమ పొలాలలో కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడకుండా సహకరించగలరు.

కాంబూరు గ్రామ పరిధిలో ఉన్న పొలాలకు నీటి సరఫరా కొరకు కాల్వలు తీయవలసియున్నందున పట్టాదారులు తమ పొలాలలో కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడకుండా సహకరించగలరు.

కాబట్టి పై పేర్కొనబడిన సర్వేనంబరులలో నివసించు రైతులు తమ తమ పొలాలలో కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడకుండా సహకరించగలరు. లేనట్లయితే కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడినట్లయితే వారి పేరుమీద కేసు నమోదు చేయబడును.

కాబట్టి పై పేర్కొనబడిన సర్వేనంబరులలో నివసించు రైతులు తమ తమ పొలాలలో కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడకుండా సహకరించగలరు. లేనట్లయితే కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడినట్లయితే వారి పేరుమీద కేసు నమోదు చేయబడును.

కాబట్టి పై పేర్కొనబడిన సర్వేనంబరులలో నివసించు రైతులు తమ తమ పొలాలలో కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడకుండా సహకరించగలరు. లేనట్లయితే కాల్వలు తీయుటకు అడ్డుపడినట్లయితే వారి పేరుమీద కేసు నమోదు చేయబడును.

తేది 12-11-1906

విశ్రాంతి మండలాధికారి

ఆలూనేనా పెంకీ దాశనంబెవ్వనాచనానుపోందిని. కేంద్రపేట

Reg. No: 3252 6220 SL2

[illegible] Reg. CC 22/2

[illegible]

[illegible] 1902 – 3 [illegible]

1 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 17 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] To

[illegible] Branch E

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Secy. 22/2/05

[illegible] 22/2/05

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಬಂಧಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೊರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವ ನಾರಣಪ್ಪನವರ ಪತ್ರ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ

ನಂಜನಗೂಡು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಹಾಡುವಳ್ಳಿ ಮುದ್ದಳ್ಳಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳ ಸಿದ್ದಮಲ್ಲಿಪ್ಪನ ಶಿಲ್ಪಿಗಳು ಅಳತೆ ಕೊಂಡ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲಸಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಲ್ಪಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಳತೆ ಕೊಂಡ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಹಾವಂಶವರಿಂದ ಅವಲೋಕಿಸುವುದು ಆ ದಿ. 7-9-1908ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ 20ನೇ ಮಹಾಮನೆಯ ಯಂತ್ರಾಲಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಲ್ಯಾಡಲು ಸುಮಾರು ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಗಳ ಕಾಗಿರುವ ವಸ್ತುಕ್ಕೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾಯಾಮುಷ್ಕರ ಕೊಂಡ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಆಯಾಮುಷ್ಕರ ರಕ್ಷಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸುವುದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಲ್ಲುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೆಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ಲೇಕ್ ಮಿಷನರಿಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಲ್ಯಾಡದ ಕೊಂದು ವರ್ಷದವರಿಗೂ ಕೀಲಿಂಗುಗೂ ಕ್ಯಾದ ಕಾಂಡಿಯಗಳ್ಳಿ ಕಾಲ್ಯಗಳು ಡಿ ಪ್ಲೇಕ್ ಮಿಷನರಿಯವರ ಕೊಂಡಿಕೆ ಅನೇಕಾವರ್ತ ಕೊಂಡಾಗ್ಯೂ ಕೀಲಿಂಗುಕಾರಿಯವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದು, ಎಂದು ವರ್ಷಕೊಂದು ಕಾರಿಯವರ್ಗದವರ ಸಮ ಗಳ್ಳನ್ನು ಆಯಾ ಕಸಬಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಶಿಲ್ಪಿಗಳು ಕೀಲ್ಯುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲ್ಲು ಮಾಡಿ ಡಿ ಪ್ಲೇಕ್ ಮಿಷನ್ ಅ ಪ್ಲೇಟ್ ಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎಷ್ಟೆ ವರ್ಷ ಕೊಂಡಿಕೆ ಕೊಂಡಿ ವಿಚಾರಿಸುವಲ್ಲಿ ಯನ್ನೂ ಆಶ್ರಯ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದ ಕೀಲ್ಯುಕ್ಕಾಯಿ ಸ್ವಸ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮಲಾಯಿರುವನ್ನು ಕೀಲ್ಯುವಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ಲೇಕ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಕುಂದೂರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಿಸ್ತಾಂಕ ಕೀಲ್ಯ ದಿನ್ನ ನೇಲ ಅಂದರೆ 1904 ನೇಲಯ ಜುಲೈ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ 13 ನೇ ಕಾರಿಯವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮಲಾಯಿರ್ ಮುಖಾಂತ್ರ ಪ್ರೇಕ್ ಜಿಕ್ಕಾ ಕಾಕಿ ಅಲಾಂಗಾಯ್ಯ ಸುಮಾರು ಕೊಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಕಂಗಳ ಪರಿಸಿಗೂ ಕ್ಷೀಲಿಸಿ ಅಲಾಯಿಕ್ಕಾಯಿ ಸ್ವಸ್ವಕ್ಕೆ 1904 ನೇಲಯ ಜುಲೈ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ 24 ನೇ ಕಾರಿಯವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿ ಪ್ಲೇಕ್ ಮಿಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ನಂಬರ್ ಮಾಡಿಯಿರುವುದು. ಆ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಲಾಂಗಾಯ್ಯ ಖಾ ವಂಶವರ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪಿಲಿಯ ಮಾಡುವ ಪಕ್ಕಿ ಮಾಳ್ಳುಕಂಗಳ ಲಾಂಗಾಯ್ಯ ಆಳುಕಂಗಳ್ಳವರಿಗೂ ಕಾಯಂ ಇಯಿರುಕ್ಕೊಂಡ

ಬಿ.ಎ

ಸೇಲ್ಸ್ ಸ್ಟೆಪ್ಸ್ ನಂಬರ್ ಒಂದೆ ನು. ——— ಯು ಪರೂಂ ತನ್ನೆಯುಪ್ತಿಗುವನೂಂಬೆ ಕ್ಷುಸಕ್ಷುಕೀಲಿ ಆ ಲಿಯೂಂ ಗ
ಸುಸುಸ್ಸಂಪಮ ಪ್ಟ್ ಪ್ಟ್ ಗಾಲ್ಗಿಪ ಕಾಲ್ಲ್ ಕಾಲ್ಪ್ ಅಸುಲ್ಲ್ ಕ್ರೀಯುಸ್ಸ್ ಗೂಂಕ್ಷಿಂಸ್ಸ್ ಅಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ್ ಯುಸ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೀಂಕ್ಷೀಲ್ಲ್ ಪ್ಟ್ ಸಂಯಿಸು ———

ಮಕ್ಕಳು 1 ನೇ ಅವಿಕಾರನಾದ ನಿಸ್ಸಮ ಲ್ಲಪ್ಪನಾದ ನನ್ನ ಮಗಳು
ನಮ್ಮ ಕೇಂಪ್ ಯಿಂದ ಹೊಂಬಾಳಿ ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ನರಶೀಪುರದ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ
ಮರಣ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ಸ್ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಂದು ತಿಂಗಳ ವರೆವಿಗೂ ಯುದ್ಧಿಸಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲಾರಿನೆ
ಯಂದ ನಂತರ ಹುಮಾರು ಕ್ರೋಂದು ತಿಂಗಳ ವರೆವಿಗೂ ನನ್ನ ಕೈಲ್ಲಿ ನೇಮಕ
ನಾದವನು ಕುಂಬಾಂಬಾಂಬಾಂಬಿ ಯುದ್ಧದ್ವಿಂದ ಯುವರು ಗಳನ್ನು ಅಪ್ಪ
ನಾನು ಯೆಂಗಳೂ ಅನಿಗಂದು ಅವಿಲ್ ದಾಖಲ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ
ನಾಂದೆ ನಂಬಿದ ನಮಾರು ಕಾಲ್ಲೋಲ ಮಾಂಕ್ಷ್ಲೀಗಳು ಲುಪ್ತ ಗಳ
ನಾ ಯುದ್ಧದ್ವಿಂದ ಲಾ ಯುಂಸ್ಸ್ ಕೇಲಿ ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತ ವಾದ ಗಳ್ಳಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಲುಪ್ತ
ಶವಂನ ನಾಪ್ತಿ ಕಿಳ್ಳು ನೋಂದಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡು ಶೋಕ ಪಾಗಂದು ಕೊಂಡ್ಲೆ
ಅವಿಲ್ ದಾಖಲ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆನು. ——. ನಾನು ಕೆಪ್ಟ್ಲೆಕ ಮಿಲಿಷನರ
ಹಾಗೂ ಆಡ್ಜುಟೆಂಟ್ ನಖಲಿನೆ ಅವಿಕಾರಿಯಾ ಪ್ಟ್ಟಿ ಕಾಂಲಿಪ್ಟ್ಲೆಕ್ಷಲಾದ
ಕಾಂಲಿಂಕಲಾ, ಅಲಾ ಗಾಯ್ಸು ಅರು ತಿಂಗಳು ಅವಿಲಿನೆ ಕಾಯ
ದೆ ಯುಸುಕ್ಕೊಂಡ ಮೈಸೂರು ಕೆಪ್ಟ್ಲೆಕ ಮಿಲಿಷನರವರ ಆಫೀಸ್ ಮುಖ
ಕಾಂಯ ಮುಸ್ಲ್ಲರು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಶಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಲ್ಲ ಪ್ಟ್ಲೆವಿಯವೆಂಕ ಕ್ಷಾಂ
ತಿಳ್ಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದನ್ನ ನನ್ನ ವಿಷ್ಟ್ಟಿಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಮಿಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಲಾ ಯಾ
ಮೇಲಿ ಹೇಳ್ಳದ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಅವಿಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲನೆಗೂ ಬಿಸಿ
ಯುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕ್ರಿಶ್ಚನ್ ಕಾಲು ಪ್ಟ್ಲೆ ವಿಷಯ ಗಳ್ಳ ಕಾ
ಲಾ ತಿಳ್ಳದ ಮೇಲ್ಲಿ ಷ್ಟ ಮಿಸ ಅವಿಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಖಲ್ಲಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡು
ನ್ನ ಲಾ ದಪ್ಪ್ರಸಲ್ ಕೊಂಡಿದ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಮಾಡಲು ಕ್ಷೀಲನೆ ——

ಅವಿಲಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಕೆಪ್ಟ್ಲೆಕ ಮಿಲಿಷನ್ ವರ ಆಫೀಸ್ ನಖಲು
ಮೇನ ದ ಯುವರೂಂ ತನೆ ಕಾಯಿಕ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕ್ಷೀಲನೆ ——

Sworn before me
Nagendra
Addl Munsiff
Bangalore
20-2-

No 3603 Eu/15 Dt 30-3-05
& 3604

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

Sl 3

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

Sl 3

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

~~& 3606 Dt 30-3-05 No. 3603 Eu/15~~

The accompanying appeal Petition No. 3252

dated 25th Feby 05 ~~received at the~~ addressed

to the Secretary ~~Dewan's Office from~~ Genl. and Rev. Deptts

by Siddamallappa and

certain others of Layur,

Nanjangud Taluk regarding

their removal from the tenancy

of the Inam lands attached

to the Anjaneya and Venu-

~~is forwarded, together with its~~

Gopala Swamy temples in the

~~enclosures, to the~~

said Village is forwarded,

together with its enclosures,

to the Dy. Commr., Mysore

Distt with a request that

the records connected with

the appeal may be subtd

at an early date.

By Order,

Draft — 28/3/05

Muzrai Secretary

BANGALORE

30-3-1905

24/3/05

Endt to the Petns

MGCPB—500—31-8-01

To

His Excellency Sir P. N. Krishnamoorthy K.C.S.I

Dewan of Mysore

The humble petition of Siddamallappa residing in Thayur Nanjangood Taluk

Humbly Showeth

That the petitioner and others presented a petition to your Excellency against the order of the Mysore Deputy Commissioner in Muzari Miscellaneous appeal No 1. 02-03. on the 1st of February 1905 and prayed that the order of the Deputy Commissioner must be suspended till the disposal of the petition

2. No order has been yet passed and the Amildar issued a notice which was served on me on the 22nd March 1905 to the effect that the petitioner did not produce an order from the Govt. within fifteen days to stay the order of the Deputy Commissioner that the order would be enforced

3. The petitioner begs leave to produce herewith the notice of the Amildar and humbly prays to issue orders to the Deputy Commissioner to stay the enforcement of the order as otherwise the petitioner will be put to the unp task of filing a suit against the Deputy missioner if he and others are deprived lands.

No. 4081 Enc

No. 3811 Encl
" 3812 Dy 15-4-05

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Sl 5

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 3663 dated 3-4-05 received at the ~~Dewan's~~ Office from Siddamallappa of Tayur, Nanjangud Taluk re their removal from the tenancy of the Inam lands endowed to the Anjaneyaswamy and Venugopala swamy temples in the said village

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~ to the Dy Commr, Mysore Distt, in contr of this office memo no 3603 dy 30-3-05, with a request that the records connected with the appeal, may be submtd at an early date.

By Order,

Draft

BANGALORE,
189 .

14/4/05
Muzrai Secretary

12/4/05

Endt to the Petr

22/4/05

MYSORE

3957

[illegible]

07/17-4-906

[illegible]

No. 4081 Emp
4082 Dy 1.5.05

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

~~No.~~ appeal Encl. 1.

The accompanying Petition No. 3907 dated 17-4-05 received at the ~~Dewan's~~ Office from Venkatakrista Char, Archak of the Anjaneya swamy and Venugopalaswamy temples at Tayur, in the Nanjangud Taluk alleging that the Dy. Commr. has ordered his removal on the ground ~~is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the~~ of his having alienated certain Devadaya Inam lands endowed to the said temple and praying for his reinstatement in office is forwarded to the Dy. Commr., Mysore Distt., in contn. of the marginally noted communication, for submission of the records already called for, ~~at an early date~~ together with a detailed report in the matter at an early date

By Order,

Dy D

29.4.05

Muzrai Secretary

BANGALORE,

188 .

29.4.05

Endt to the Petn.

& no: 3603 Dy 30:3:05
& no: 3811 Dy 15:4:05

Refers
[illegible]
26/5/05

MYSORE COLL
4385
SECRETARIAT

~~189~~ 1904-1905
Sl 8

From
H. L. Charles Esquire
Commissioner
Mysore District

To
L. Anantaswami Rao Esq. B.A.
Secy. to Govt. Mug. Dept.

Dated 22nd May 1905

Despatched 23rd

Received

General No. 137
No.

Enclosure No. 3 appeal petns + 2 files

Submits entire records (both original and appellate) regarding the removal of Sidda Mallappa & others of Tayur, Nanjangud Taluk from the tenancy of Inam lands attached to the Anjaneyaswami & Venugopalaswami temples in the said village.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District

No 437
Encl: 3 appeal petitions + 2 files

Dated Mysore 22/23 May 1905

To

L. Anantasawmi Rao Esq. B.A
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Mugmi Department

Sir,

As called for in your official memorandum No. 3003 of the 30th March 1905 and subsequent communication ending with your official memorandum No. 4081 of 1st May 1905, I have the honor to retransmit the enclosures received with the above together with the entire records (both original and appellate) regarding the removal of Sidda Mallappa and others of Tayur in the Nanjangud Taluk from the tenancy of the Inam lands attached to the Anjaneyaswami and Venugopala Swami temples in the said village.

The facts of the case will be found in the order passed by Mr. Kantaraj Urs in Mugrai Miscellaneous appeal No 1 of 1902-1903.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

[signature]
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

C/S
13/6

Sl 9

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

1905—1906.

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq. B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Secretary to Government,

General & Revenue Departments.

Dated 21.St

Despatched July 1905

Received

General No. 432

Enclosure No. Enl-1.

With reference to his Memo. No. R.7683/Mis.624-04-1 dated 27th February 1905, forwarding the papers connected with the appeal of Sidda - Mallappa and others of Tayur village in the Sanjangud taluk, regarding their removal from the tenancy of certain inam lands attached to the Anjaneya swami ~~temple~~ and Venugopalaswami temples in the said village, has the honor to request that the Deputy Commissioner's letter referred to in the Office Note, may be forwarded to this Office for reference in connection with disposal of the communication No. 437 dated 22nd May 1905, from the same Officer on the subject to this Office.

By Order,

2. The Office note is herewith sent for reference & return.

Secret

559
31.7.05

G.R.S. 29A]

190

Sl 10

From
B.K.Venkata Varada Iyengar Esq

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Genl. and Rev. Dept.

9.7 05

To
The Secretary to the Government of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore:

Muzrai Department.

Dated

Despatched 29th July 1905

Received

General No. R1347

No.

Enclosure No. 1

In returning the office note received with his docket No 432 dated the 21st July 1905 requesting that the Deputy Commissioner's letter mentioned in the said note re-the tenancy of certain Inam lands belonging to the Muzrai institution in Tayur village Nanjangud Taluk, might be sent to him, has the honor to state that the letter referred to was in connection with a parallel case and copy of the said letter was forwarded to him with this Office No R2949/mis

No. 14-02-16 dated the 30th September 1904

By Order,

For Secretary.

~~Sl 10~~

Mazzini Sl 4

Read

Petition dated 1st February 1905 from Siddamallappa and other cultivators of the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneyasvam and Kesavasami temples at Jagur in the Nanjangud Taluk, appealing against the order of the Offg Commr (Mr M. Kantaraja Urs) directing their eviction from the possession of the Inam lands —

Petition dated 17th April 1905 from

17.1.06

Read 19/1/06

19/1/06

(2)

Venkatakrishnamachar

Archaka of the said temples

appealing against the

order of the Dy Commr

(Mr M. Kantaraj Urs)

directing his removal from

the Archakship in the

said temples

Correspondence

ending with letter No

R $\frac{1347}{\text{mis}}$ dated 29th July 1905

from the Secretary to Govt,

General & Revenue Departments

transferring the ~~above~~

appeal petition of the

ryots for disposal by

Government in the ~~Land~~ Religious

~~& Revenue~~ Departments

No 3118 D/23.1.06

Encl: 2 files.

Order:- From the records

from the Dy Commr

with his letter no 437 dated 23rd May 1905, it is observed that there are three questions to be decided viz (i) about the alienation of one of the Inam lands (S. no 25) (ii) about the eviction of the present cultivators from the possession of the Inam lands ordered by the Offg Dy Comr Mr M Kantaraja Urs and (iii) regarding the removal of the Archak Venkata Krishnachar ordered by the Dy Comr on the ground that he was also concerned in the alienation

As

(4)

2. As regards the question of alienation of the temple lands and the existence of the present cultivations, it is observed from the Sale Deed executed on the 3rd December 1892 by one Linnappa in favour of Lidhamallappa Setty (one of the appellants) that one-half of the S. No 25 assessed at 1½ acres belonging to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple, have been sold by the same person to the same individual on the 16th November 1888 and that the other half was sold in December 1892 for Rs 200

Such alienation of Devadaya land (5)
cannot now be recognized.

3. From the statements given by the other cultivators before the Amildar during his enquiry in April 1904, it is also clear that they were paying an inadequate amount to the Pujari on the alleged ground that the lands had been purchased by them from the former cultivators. What right Sivanagga and other cultivators had to sell the Devadaya Inam lands is not explained. The contention of the appellants that they are Kadim tenants

(6)

is not tenable as they have been in possession of the lands unauthorizedly — In these circumstances the Dy Comr's order in the matter of applying the alienation Rules of 1877 to these lands is upheld and the petition of ~~the~~ Siddamallappa and other cultivators rejected. Option may however be given to them to retain the lands on payment of a reasonable gutta that may hereafter be fixed by the Dy Comr.

~~B.~~ 4 As regards the removal of the Archak Venkatakrishnachar ~~ordered~~ by the Offg Dy Comr Mr Kantaraja Urs.

having written the

Sale Deed in 1892 referred to above, the Archak states in his appeal petition that, as the Shambhogue of the village had written the first document selling one-half of the land in question in 1888, he was led to believe that ~~the~~ Devadaga lands were alienable and accordingly wrote the Sale Deed in respect of the other ~~other~~ half on behalf of the executor Sevanagga. Having regard to this the Government are of opinion that he

m.

(6) (8)

is may be warned this time.

been ~~his the punishment of his~~

~~and that dismissal~~

the ~~from the Archak's post~~

in ~~is too severe, a punishment~~

the The Dy Comr is accordingly

is requested to reinstate

him in his Office –

~~4~~. 5 With a view to have

a proper check over the

income and expenditure

of the temple, it is necessary

to fix a scale of expenditure

with reference to the income

from the Inam lands.

The Dy Comr is requested

to submit his proposals

on this point.

As the temple is

noted to be in a state

disrepair ~~the Archak~~.

Venkatakrishnachar Archak should be required to execute the necessary repairs within 6 months, with a warning that all the Inam lands would be attached in case of his failure to do so.

Dbl

Secretary to Govt.
Mugrai Dept.

Ks

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore District,
returning the enclosure
to his letter no 437
dated 23rd May 1905.

x Endts to petitions

(1) Siddamallappa and others No. 3119 D/23 1.06

(2) Venkatakrishnachar No. 3120 D/23 1.06

No 3119

Sl 12

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1905

[illegible] 5742

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 25 [illegible]

[illegible] 1888 [illegible] 16 [illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible]

[illegible] 1877 [illegible]

[illegible]

No 3120

Sl 13

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

By order

28-1-06

(Dewan's order)

28/1/06

Secretary to Govt

Mugamai Dept

~~St 11~~
Sl 14

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore District

49

Sir,

In continuation of paras 2 and 3 of the Government Pro: No 3118 dated 23rd January 1906, passing orders on the appeal petition of Sudda-Malloppa and other cultivators regarding the alienation of the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneya-swami and the Venugopalaswami -

(2/

at Sáyúr in the Nanjangud Taluk, I am directed to forward herewith petition regd no 4551 dated 3rd April 1907, together with its 5 enclosures, received from Siddo-malappa, one of the cultivators of the Inam lands -

2. The petitioner was heard by the 2nd Councillor on the 16th instant, and he represented that he purchased the Sáyavali hak ~~[illegible]~~ of one of the Inam lands (S. no 25) from one Sivanagga ~~in~~ part in 1888 and the remainder in 1892 for a sum of

70. that ~~[illegible]~~ at

the time of ~~the~~ purchase;
the land was only dry
and became wet after-
-wards ~~owing to the~~ Consequent on
Channel Extension
~~introduction of a Channel~~;
and that he had to
incur ~~lay~~ an outlay of about
Rs 1000 for the improve-
-ment of the land
and making it fit
for wet cultivation.
He also stated that
he paid the ~~rate~~ acreage contribution
to Govt ~~amount~~, in addition
to the waterrate and
the assessment of the
land, which latter amounted
~~in all~~ to Rs 21 odd
per annum. He

that the ~~land~~ land might

be continued to him

on payment of the usual amount.

~~[illegible]~~

On enquiry, it was ~~[illegible]~~

ascertained from him

that all the other Inam lands of the Temples

had been already leased out by the Amildar

~~at~~ either to the same lessees

or to others for a somewhat higher

gutta; that the S. No 25

in dispute was offered

to him ~~[illegible]~~

for an annual gutta

of Rs 55 including

the water-rate and

the assessment, which was the offered by another person but

that he having declined ~~to~~ the offer on the

~~take it up the lease~~ that the land was his it would

a loss to him ~~[illegible]~~

lease was given over to one Nanjappa for a period of 5 years —

3. Concurring with the Dy Comr, the Govt have already passed orders in their Ins referred to above, that the transaction between Sivanagga and the petitioner should be treated under the Alienation Rules of 1877 and that the unauthorized enjoy-ment of the land by the latter could not be continued

any longer. There are no grounds to reconsider this position of the ~~to~~ order and the petitioner should be informed accordingly.

4. In consideration however of the fact, ~~however,~~ that the petitioner might have incurred some outlay for the improvement of the land in question, it seems equitable to ~~fix~~ lease out the land to him on ~~accept~~ a somewhat reduced quitrent ~~from~~ ~~him~~; but, what reduction can be reasonably made in this man's

has to be decided

on knowing the approximate expenditure incurred by him on the land, after it came to his possession from Linganappa. I am to request you to kindly furnish information on this point, and also to favour Government with your opinion as to whether the present lessee Nanjappa, to whom the land is said to have been leased out already for Rs 55 for a period of 5 years, can be disturbed now, with a view to

8

lease to the petitioner

for the same period,

and if so, what reduced

gutta may be accepted

from ~~him~~ the (petitioner)

The favour of an

early reply is requested.

I have &c

17/7/07

Dept

Secretary

Mugrai Dept

17/7/07

Sent for

approval

18 7

16/7/07

Remender

Muz I Aj

190

From

To

The Dy Commr,
Mysore Distt

Despatched

Received

General No. 9/1/
No.

Enclosure No.

This office no 282 dated 22d July 1904 calling for certain information, on the petition of Siddamallappa, in the matter of leasing out on reduced gutta, the Inam lands endowed to the Temples at Tazur in the Nanjangud Tk

Referring to the above, has the honor to forw

GPB—3,000—21 7-03

herewith petition registered
no 1472 dated 29th Septr 1907
from the said individual
on the same subject and
to request that the report
already called for thereon
may be submitted at a
very early date.

By order
D(A) 15/10/07
Secretary
15/10/07

1907-08 ~~SL 17~~ SL 15

From
M. Kantaraj Urs Esq., B.A.
Dy. Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To
L. Ananta Sawmi Rao Esq., B.A.
Secy. to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, ~~Gen. & Rev.~~ Muzrai Dept.

Dated 24th November 1907.

Despatched

Received

General No. 217
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Subject

Submits report on the petition of Sidda Mallappa in the matter of leasing out on reduced gutta the Inam lands endowed to the temples at Tayur.

Name of Guttadar	Survey No.	Cash Gutta per annum
Madiah	165	11-0-0
Madiah	174	10-0-0
Javanayya	130	12-8-0
Nanjappa	418 } 419 }	55-0-0
Siddia	161	5-0-0
Tayur Venkata Krishnachar.	175	13-8-0
Nanja	156	13-0-0
Dodda Nanjappa	164	10-8-0
9 Madappa	89	12-0-0
10 Madia	167	7-0-0
Total		149-8-0

BA Refer please
27.11.07

No. 217
Enc. No. Nil

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner

MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore Camp 24th November 1907.

To

L. Ananthasami Rao, B.A.
Esq.,
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
~~GENERAL AND REVENUE~~ Inam DEPARTMENTS.

SIR,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No. 7118 dated 23-1-1906 and in reply to your letter No. 282 dated 22nd July 1907 and subsequent docket No. 2004 dated 13-10-07 forwarding for report petitions ((herewith retransmitted) from Sidda Mallappa in the matter of leasing out on reduced gutta the Inam lands endowed to the temples at Tayur in the Nanjangud Taluk, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. All the temple Inam lands were taken possession of by Government and were leased out by Mr. Krishnaswamiengar, late Amildar of the Nanjangud Taluk, to the marginally noted persons for a period of 5 years and mutchalikas obtained from them on 25-2-1906.

3. These cultivators have executed mutchalikas to tender the Gutta amount annually to the Taluk in

in the month of January (vide Mutchalikas herewith submitted). The Gutta amount for Parabhava (1906-07 ~~14-8-0~~) due in January 1907 not having yet been tendered, notices are said to have been issued to the parties and on receipt of the amount it will be credited to the funds of the Institution. The Mutchalikas have been executed on plain paper and if desired necessary they will be ~~taken~~ obtained on stamp paper.

4. The archak Venkatakrishnachar has been reinstated as ordered in para 4 of Government Proceedings No. 3118 dated 23-1-06.

5. Two lists showing the expenditure in the temples as detailed below have been produced by the archak Venkatakrishnachar

Temple	Nityakatle	Hetchukatle	Pay	annual repairs	Total
1. Sri Venugopala Swami	50-7-0	23-15-0	60-0-0	12-8-0	146-14-0
2. Sri Anjaneya Swami	50-7-0	23-15-0	60-0-0	12-8-0	146-14-0
	100-14-0	47-14-0	120-0-0	25-0-0	293-12-0

He further promises that if the Inam lands be given over to him, he would maintain the temples in an efficient condition and conduct all services therein, adding that the patta of the Inam ~~lands~~ lands may remain in the name of the deity and that should he be found to alienate the lands he might be removed from his office.

6. After careful scrutiny and particularly with reference to the income from the Inam lands, the Amildar (Mr. Dharma Rao) has submitted a list shewing the expenditure to be incurred annually in the two temples at a cost of Rs. 144-14-6 The Amildar's proposal to fix the scale at Rs.60-6-0 for Nityakatle; 29-10-0 for Hetchukatle ; 48-0-0 for pay of Archak of both the t

and 6-14-6 for annual repairs. Total 144-14-6annually seems to be resonable and may be sanctioned as only 144-14-6 are repo ed to be available from the income of the Inam lands after pa ing Government dues.

7. As diredted by Government a notice was issued to the archak for the repairs of the temples and his reply thereto stating that the repairs would cost 5 or 6 hundred rupees, that he has himself paid the contribution amount and attended to the work of the temple without receiving any renumeration in retur that therefore either the produce of the landsor the kandayam be recovered from the Guttadars and paid to him for being utilized towards the repairs of the temples, which he promises to attend to by contributing if necessary some amount from his private funds, that a proper estimate might be got prepared by Government and that he would have the necessary repairs executed within 3 months from the date of giving him the arrears of previous years, is filed with the accompanying records.

8. Whatever amount might have been paid to the Archak by the ryots, previous to survey and settlement, it is evident that the Archak has not been benefited or renumerated in any way subsequent to the year Vilambi (98-99).

9. The cultivators have in their mutchalika dated 13-12-04 agreed to give the produce of the previous years provided the Inam lands were registered in the name of the temple. Now

Now that Government in the Proceedings quoted above have declined to recognize the cultivators as kadim tenants,, the Amildar states that as it is not possible to ascertain what particular crop and how much was harvested every year, it would be equitable to recover, if so ordered, only the kandayam amount fixed on each survey No.

10. From the statement appended to the Amildar's report a sum of Rs. 518-4-1 has to be recovered from the several cultivators.

11. Archak Venkatakrishnachar admits having received the kandayam from the Sidda Malla setty for the years 1903-04,04-05, and 05-06 viz. 66-4-6. Deducting this amount, a sum of Rs. 451-15-7 has yet to be recovered from the other cultivators.

12. The Amildar therefore recommends that the amount of kandayam from Vilambi (1898-99) to Vishwavasu (1905-06) which the archak is entitled to get may be ordered to be recovered and utilized for the repairs of the Institution which should be executed by Government agency after getting up a proper estimate, any extra amount required therefor being made good by the Archak.

13. The Amildar further reports that steps would be taken for the recovery of the Gutta amount for the year Parabhava (1906-07), that the amount for Plavanga (1907-8) will have to be recovered in January 1908 and if the proposal now submitted be accepted, the amount required for Nityakatle and Hetchukatle would be reserved out of the amount to be recovered and the balance paid to t

to the Archak.

14. The proposals of the Amildar being reasonable Government may be pleased to accord their sanction thereto.

15. After inspection of the lands the Amildar reports that it is not possible to state accurately what amount has been spent to convert the dry land into wet land that as opined by the Panchayats about Rs. 250/ might have been the approximate amount.

16. Manjappa is reported to be the nephew (ಅಳಿಯ) of Siddappa Mallappa. It is moreover ascertained that he is only a nominal Guttadar, the actual cultivator being Sidda Mallappa, and that there is no objection to transfer the lease to Sidda Mallappa for the same period.

17. As Mallaiya was cultivating the land from the commencement there is no doubt he has been benefitted much inas much as he was paying only the Kandayam to the archak, taking the produce himself. The Amildar states that on enquiry it was ascertained that during the year 1906-07 about 45 or 47 pallas of Paddy were realized while according to Mallaiya's own statement, the quantity was 39 pallas. Calculating the price of paddy even so low as Rs. 4/ per palla the total amount realized was 19½x4 --Rs. 78 for Rajapal. Deducting Rs. 55/ due to the temple, there remained a net balance of Rs 23 which is a source of profit to the cultivator.

18. The Amildar is of opinion that anything less than 6 pallas per acre or 25 pallas per year to the temple would not be a fair Gutta.

72

19 I am therefore not in favour of recommending a gutta less than 25 pallas.

20. Mr. Dharma Rao, Amildar of the Nanjangode Taluk has submitted a clear and elaborate report in his Nos 196 dated 12-7-07 and 65 dated 20-9-07 a kind perusal of which may throw further light in the subject.

21. The file of vernacular papers bearing on the subject received with the Amildar's report No. $\frac{65}{211}$ dated 20-9-1907 is herewith submitted for favour of refenence.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

for Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District.

Draft for approval.

Muzrai

3.1.07

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 217, dated 24th November 1907, submitting a report on the petition of Sidda Mallappa in the matter of leasing out the inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami and Sri Venugopalaswami temples at Jayur in the Nanjangud Taluk, I am directed to invite reference to this Office No 282, dated 22nd July 1907, wherein information was called for on the following points :—

(1) the expenditure that might have been likely incurred by Sidda Mallappa for converting the dry land into wet the acreage

paid by him to Govt the water rate and the assessment on the land.

(2) Whether the present lessee of Nanjappa can be disturbed now and with a view ~~of~~ to re-transfer the lease to Lidda Mallappa, and if so, what reduced patta may be accepted from ~~him~~ the latter

2. It is observed from the letter under reply that the Panchayetdars estimate the expenditure incurred by Lidda Mallappa for converting the dry land into wet at Rs 250/-, but that no information is furnished as to the amount of contribution paid by him to Govt, the water-rate and the assessment on the land, though ~~these two~~ the last item is ~~latter~~ are ascertained from Nanjappa's Mutchalika ~~to be Rs 15~~ amount to Rs 21/-.

3. As regards the 2nd point,

it is reported that there is no objection to transfer the lease to Sidda Mallappa as the said Nanjappa is only the nominal guttedar, the actual cultivator being only Sidda Mallappa. The Amildar reports that calculating the income derived from the land in question to be 39 p[illegible] and at Rs 4/- per palla, and after deducting therefrom one half of the produce due as the temples' share, and also the gutta of Rs 55/- as now fixed, the balance of Rs 23/- goes to the cultivator as a clear profit to him and that therefore the gutta of Rs 55/- is reasonable. In the letter under reply, however, it is stated that anything less than 25 pallas per year

fair gutta. I am however to observe that the gutta of the land in question has been given to a person other than Sidda Mallappa only for Rs 55/- (assessment to be being included in that amount) and it is not understood why the gutta should be increased to 25 pallas for the temple's share while the information called for in this Office No 282, dated 22nd July 1907 was what reduced gutta might be accepted from Sidda Mallappa to which concession the said individual was considered by Govt. to be entitled to in virtue of the improvements effected by him to the land. Moreover it is stated in the letter under reply, that Sidda Mallappa appropriated himself the income from the land the time it was in his possession

paying only Kandayam to the temple Archak. ~~But it is obse and that~~ But it is observed ~~that that~~ income will have to be set off against the interest ~~one~~ on the outlay incurred by him in improving the land

4. Under the foregoing circs, the enclosures to your letter under reply are returned herewith for reference and ~~for~~ re-submission together with information on each of the points referred to above, ~~at an early date~~, so as to enable Govt to pass final orders thereon, and also to fix a scale of expenditure in the Institutions in question and also on the other points ref.d to in the letter under reply.

5. The favor of an early reply is requested.

I have &c,

[signature] 5/1/08

[signature] 17.12.08 Secretary

15/4

Muz. 1]

190

From

To

The Dy. Commr

Mysore Distt

Dated

Despatched 23 4 08.

Received

General No. 4646

No.

Enclosure No. 20

In contn. of this office letter no 3023 Dy 9th January 1908 calling for certain information regarding the leasing out of the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneya Swamy and Sri Venugopala Swamy temple at Tayur,

in the Nanjangud

Taluk, has the honor

to forward herewith petition

registered no 3635 of

9th March 1908 from

Siddamallappa on the subject,

and to request that

the submission of the

report may be expedited

By order

D(G) [signature] 17/4/08

Secretary

Indt. to the petr.

[signature] 18/4/08

1907-08 (14)

From

M. Kantarajlas Esq., B.A. Sl 17

Dy. Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

L. Anantasawmi Rao Esq., B.A.

Secy. to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, ~~Gen. & Rev.~~ Mines Depts.

Dated 13th May 08

Despatched

Received

General No. 485
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Subject.

Submits further report on the petn from Sidda Mallappa

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4636
16.5.08
JUZRAI SECRETARIAT

Refer
GA
Please con time note
[illegible] 16/5/08

No. 485
Enc. No. 1 file

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commr

MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore/Camp 13th May 1908.

To

L. Anantasawmi Rao Esq., B.A.

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT

OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

~~GENERAL AND REVENUE~~ Muzrai DEPARTMENT~~S~~.

SIR,

In reply to your letter No. 3023 dated 9-1-08 calling for further report on the petition of Sidda Mallappa in the matter of leasing out the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneya Swami and Sri Venugopala Swami temples at Tayur in the Nanjangud Taluk, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The expenditure that might have been likely incurred by Sidda Mallappa for converting the dry land into wet is estimated at Rs 250/-

3. The amildar reports that a reference to the accounts shews that the average contribution, water rate and assessment paid by

Sidda

Sidda Mallappa amounts to Rs 127-8-4 as detailed on the margin†

4. Sidda Mallappa states that the Kandayam subsequent to the Zear Vilambi was paid to the Archak but no documentary evidences have been produced by him in support of his statement.

5. It is reported that there is no objection to the retransfer of the lease to Sidda Mallappa.

6. The petitioner has been complaining that he suffered loss but from the Amildar's report it is understood that the petitioner has been profitted to the extent of Rs 162/- up to the Zear Parabhava when the land passed into others hands

7. As however Government considers that Sidda Mallappa is entitled to some concession on account of the improvements effected by him, the gutta of Rs 55/- per annum may be ordered to be continued to be paid by Sidda Mallappa

8. The amildar's report no

21-4-98	Kandayam	Do Do	19-15-10
26-4-98	Contribution	Do - Do	6-4-0
23-10-98	amount paid to Archak by Do		5-0-0
	Amount admitted by the Archak as having been paid by Sidda Mallappa for 3 Zears when the crop was attached by Govt.		66-4-6
		Total	127-8-4

238/482 dated 20.2.08 and its enclosures together with the petition received with the marginally noted communication are herewith submitted for reference.

No	Date
4646	23 4.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

[illegible]

Deputy Commr
Mysore District

Draft for approval

Muzrai

Issue & Print
15/6/08

Read:—

Govt. Pro. No 3118, dated 23rd January 1906, directing the resumption of the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneya swami and Sri Gopalakrishna swami temples at Tayur in the Nanjangud Taluk.

Govt. Order No. 282, dated 22nd July 1907, rejecting the petition of Sidda Mallappa and other ryots of the villages, appealing against the aforesaid Order.

Correspondence ending with letter No. 485, dated 13th May 1908, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District

5668-9
17-6-1908

The Govt observe that there are 3 points in this case which orders are called for, namely;
(1) the lease of certain temples lands Sidda Mallappa;
(2) the repairs of the temples; and
(3) the scale of Expenditure in the Instn

As regards the 1st ~~point~~ lease of the lands, it is observed that

Order thereon:—

In the course of the hearing of the Appeal on which the Govt Order of the 22nd July 1907

passed, Sidda Mallappa, one of the cultivators of the Inam lands endowed to the temples of Sri Anjaneyaswami and Venu-Gopalaswami at Jayur, represented that, consequent on channel extension, he had to incur a heavy outlay for improving the land and making it fit for wet cultivation, and that he paid the acreage contribution in addition to water-rate and assessment, and prayed that the land might be continued to him, on payment of the usual amount. He further stated that the same land was offered to him for an annual gutta of Rs 55 including the water rate and assessment but that he declined the offer on the ground that ~~the land~~ it would be a loss to him 'the land was

given out to one Nanjappa for a period of 5 years.

2. In the Govt Order rejecting the appeal, it was ~~accordingly~~ observed that in consideration of the fact that the said Sidda Mallappa might have incurred some outlay on the improvement of the land in question, it appeared equitable to lease out the land to him on a ~~somewhat~~ reduced footing, but that what reduction could reasonably be made had to be decided on ascertaining the approximate expenditure incurred by him on the land after it came into his possession from the previous culti-vator Sivanayya. The Deputy Commissioner was ~~[illegible]~~

to furnish information on this point and also to favor Govt with his opinion as to whether the present lessee Nanjappa to whom the land had been already leased out for Rs 55/- for a period of 5 years could be disturbed with a view to re-transfer the lease to Sidda Mallappa for the same period, and if so, what reduced putta might be accepted from him.

3 The Deputy Commissioner reports in reply that the Amildar states that the Panchayetdars estimate the expenditure incurred by Sidda Mallappa for improving the land at Rs 250/-, but that it is not now possible to ascertain exactly the extent of the improvements effected by him a number of yrs

and that the average

contribution, water-rate and assessment paid by him amount to Rs 127-8-4. He further states that the present lessee Nanjappa, who is the nephew of Sidda Mallappa, is only the nominal Sutkedar, the actual cultivator being himself Sidda Mallappa, and that therefore no objection will be raised to re-transfer the lease to the latter. He further reports that, on enquiry it was ascertained that during the year 1906-07, about 46 or 47 pallas of paddy were realised and that according to Mallappa's own statement that the quantity realised was 39 pallas, [illegible]

~~[illegible]~~ and after deducting one-half of the last named quantity as Rajpal, and calculating the price of the other half at so low a rate as Rs 4 per palla, and deducting from this amount the gutta of Rs 55/- as now fixed, the balance of Rs 23/- goes to the cultivator as a clear profit. ~~to him~~; ~~and therefore reports that~~ The Deputy Commissioner expresses the opinion that as Sidda Mallappa has appropriated to himself the income from the land during the time it was in his possession paying only the Kandayam to the temple Archak, anything less than 25 pallas per year would be a fair gutta. ~~He however~~

He moreover observes that the complaint of Sidda Mallappa that he suffered loss is not true as it is understood that he has been profited to the extent of Rs 162/- up to the year Parabhava when the land passed into others hands. In conclusion, the Deputy Commissioner recommends, that as the Govt consider that Sidda Mallappa is entitled to some concession on account of the improvements effected by him the putta of Rs 55 per annum may be ordered to be continued to be paid by Sidda Mallappa

4. Under the circs reported the Govt are pleased to sanction the Deputy Commissioner's recommendation He is

requested to issue needful instructions to have the lease of the land re-transferred to Sidda Mallappa on condition of his paying a putta of Rs 55 per year, for the next 5 years

As it is reported that the Archak Venkatakrishnappa promises to maintain the in an efficient condition and conduct all services therein if the inam lands are given over to him, the Deputy is requested to inform him that the matter will be the consideration of Govt, after the expiry of the 5 period for which the lease has been sanctioned for Sidda Mallappa.

5 Next as regards the repairs of the temples, it was directed in the Govt Pro. of the 23rd Jany 1906, read above that the repairs should be got done by Venkata-Krishnappa, the newly restored Archak It is now reported that the said Archak pleads inability, as the repairs are estimated to cost 5 or 6 hundred rupees but that he states that if either the arrears of the produce or of the Kandayam is recovered from the Guttadars & paid to him; would himself contribute

to make up the necessary amount of the estimate and complete the repairs within 3 months thereafter. The Amildar, ~~in~~ supporting the Archak's prayer, and states that the cultivators of the lands not having been ~~declared~~ ~~to be~~ recognised by Govt as Kadim tenants, it is not possible to ascertain from them what particular crop and how much was harvested every year, and recommends that only the arrears of Kandayam which amount to Rs 457-15-7 may be recovered from those from whom they are due. In this view the Deputy Commissioner concurs.

6 The Deputy Commissioner's recommendation is approved.

The arrears of up to the year Vis

are stated to amount to Rs451-15-7 ~~should be recovered~~ as well as that for the years Parábhava and Plavanga ~~which~~ ~~of~~ which remains still uncollected, should be recovered from the Pattadars concerned, and credited to the funds of the Institution, in view to the same being utilised for the repairs. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to have an estimate prepared for the repairs of the temples question and submit it the sanction of Govt at an date.

7 In para 5 of the Govt Pro the 23rd January 1906, the Deputy sioner was also requested a scale of expenditure the two temples in question with a view to exercise proper check

over the income and expenditure of the temple lands. A scale has been submitted by the Deputy Commissioner, who states that it has been prepared by the Amildar Mr Dharma Rao after careful scrutiny and ~~with refe~~ particularly with reference to the income from the inam and from the scale, it is observed that ~~Rs 60~~ against an income of Rs 144-14-6 due to the temple per annum after payment of Govt dues, an expenditure of Rs ~~68-2-0~~ 56-6-0 is proposed to be fixed for Nityakatle, Rs ~~31-14-0~~ 33-10-0 for Hechukatle, Rs 48-0-0 for pay of the Archak of both the temples and Rs 6-14-6 for ~~the~~ annual repairs. The Deputy Commissioner is of opinion that the scale is

a reasonable and maybe adopted.

8. Under the circ^ces represented,

the proposed scale which appears suitable

is ~~accordingly~~ sanctioned. A statement

of the scale as now sanctioned

is appended hereto.

Secretary

To

12/6/08

The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore Dt.,

returning enclosures

" Compt^r Mysore Govt —

15/6/08

Issue

15/6

Statement shewing the sanctioned scale of expenditurein the

Sri Venugopalaswami and Anjaneyaswami temples at Tayur:-

		Rs.	A.	p.
Nityakatle:-	Rice for nivedana at ½ seer per diem	21	10	0.
	Gingelly Oil @ ½ seer per diem	10	2	0.
	Cotton	1	8	0
	Camphor.	5	0	0
	Incense	1	0	0
	Sandal	0	10	0
	Betel leaves and nuts.	3	12	0.
	Plantains	4	8	0
	Flowers	1	8	0
	Firewood	3	0	0
	Ghee	2	12	0
	Total	56	6	0.
Hetchukatle:-	Tailamrita and Panchamrita Abhisheka on every Saturday	9	12	0
	Krishna Jayanti	1	0	0.
	Hanuma Jayanti	0	8	0
	Yugadi	0	8	0
	Sri Ramanavami	0	8	0
	Navaratri	2	8	0
	H.H. the Maharaja's birthday	0	8	0
	Deeparadhane expenses in the month of Kariteka at 0-4-0 per diem.	7	8	0
	Yuvaraja's birthday	0	8	0
	Rathasaptami	0	8	0
	Deepavali	0	8	0
	Daksinayana	0	8	0
	Uttarayana	0	8	0

continued)

Dhanurmasa	3 - 12 - 0
Madhwanavami	0- 10 -0
One pair of Dhotra.	4 - 0 - 0
Total	33 - 10 - 0.
Archak on Rs 4 per month	48 - 0 -0.
Amount to be annually set apart for repairs.	6 - 14 - 6.
Grand Total	144 - 14 - 6.

1907-08

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 17th June 1908

No. $\frac{5668\text{-}9}{\text{Muz. F. 2-1907}}$

Passing orders on the affairs of the Sri Anjaneya and Venugopalaswami temples at Tayur in the Nanjangud Taluk and fixing a scale of expenditure therein.

GPB—10 7 08—200

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

READ—

Government Proceedings No. 3118, dated 23rd January 1906, directing the resumption of the inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneyaswami and Sri Venugopalaswami temples at Tayur in the Nanjangud Taluk.

Government Order No. 282, dated 22nd July 1907, rejecting the petition of Siddamallappa and other raiyats of the villages, appealing against the aforesaid order.

Correspondence ending with letter No. 485, dated 13th May 1908, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

No. 5668-9—MUZ. F. 2-1907, DATED CAMP MYSORE, 17TH JUNE 1908.

ORDER THEREON.—The Government observe that there are three points in this case on which orders are called for, namely :—

(1) the lease of certain temple lands to Siddamallappa;
(2) the repairs of the temples; and
(3) the scale of expenditure in the institutions.

As regards the lease of the lands, it is observed that in the course of the hearing of the appeal on which the Government order of the 22nd July 1907 was passed, Siddamallappa, one of the cultivators of the inam lands endowed to the temples of the Sri Anjaneyaswami and Venugopalaswami at Tayur, represented that, consequent on channel extension, he had to incur a heavy outlay for improving the land and making it fit for wet cultivation, and that he paid the acreage contribution in addition to water-rate and assessment, and prayed that the land might be continued to him, on payment of the usual amount. He further stated that the same land was offered to him for an annual guttà of Rs. 55 including the water-rate and assessment, but that he declined the offer on the ground that it would be a loss to him and that therefore the land was given out to one Nanjappa for a period of five years.

2. In the Government order rejecting the appeal, it was observed that in consideration of the fact that the said Siddamallappa might have incurred some outlay on the improvement of the land in question, it appeared equitable to lease out the land to him on a somewhat reduced gutta, but that what reduction could reasonably be made had to be decided on ascertaining the approximate expenditure incurred by him on the land after it came into his possession from the previous cultivator Sivanaiya. The Deputy Commissioner was requested to furnish information on this point and also to favor Government with his opinion as to whether the present lessee Nanjappa to whom the land had already been leased out for Rs. 55 for a period of five years could be disturbed with a view to retransfer the lease to Siddamallappa for the same period and if so, what reduced gutta might be accepted from him.

3. The Deputy Commissioner reports in reply that the Amildar states that the panchayetdars estimate the expenditure incurred by Siddamallappa for improving the land at Rs. 250, but that it is not now possible to ascertain exactly the extent of the improvements effected by him a number of years previously and that the acreage contribution, water-rate and assessment paid by him amount to Rs. 127-8-4. He further states that the present lessee Nanjappa, who is the nephew of Siddamallappa, is only the nominal guttedar; the actual cultivator being Siddamallappa himself and that therefore no objection will be raised to retransfer the lease to the latter. He further reports that on enquiry it was ascertained that during the year 1906-07, about 46 or 47 pallas of paddy were realised and that according to Malappa's own statement that the quantity realised was 39 pallas and after deducting one-half of the last named quantity as Rajapal, and calculating the price of the other half at so low a rate as Rs. 4 per palla, and deducting from this amount the gutta of Rs. 55 as now fixed, the balance of Rs. 23 goes to the cultivator as a clear profit. The Deputy Commissioner expresses the opinion that as Siddamallappa has appropriated to himself the income from the land during the time it was in his possession paying only the kandayam to the temple archak, anything less than 25 pallas per year would not be a fair gutta. He moreover

observes that the complaint of Siddamallappa that he suffered loss is not true as it is understood that he has been profited to the extent of Rs. 162 up to the year Parabhava when the land passed into others' hands. In conclusion, the Deputy Commissioner recommends that, as the Government consider that Siddamallappa is entitled to some concession on account of the improvements effected by him, the gutta of Rs. 55 per annum may be ordered to be continued to be paid by Siddamallappa.

4. Under the circumstances reported, the Government are pleased to sanction the Deputy Commissioner's recommendation. He is requested to issue needful instructions to have the lease of the land retransferred to Siddamallappa on condition of his paying a gutta of Rs. 55 per year, for the next five years. As it is reported that the archak Venkatakrishnachar promises to maintain the temples in an efficient condition and conduct all services therein if the inam lands are given over to him, the Deputy Commissioner is requested to inform him that the matter will receive the consideration of Government after the expiry of the five years period for which the present lease has been sanctioned for Siddamallappa.

5. Next as regards the repairs of the temples it was directed in the Government Proceedings of the 23rd January 1906 read above, that the repairs should be got done by Venkatakrishnachar, the newly restored archak. It is now reported that the said archak pleads inability, as the repairs are estimated to cost five or six hundred rupees but that he states that if either the arrears of the produce or of the kandayam is recovered from the guttadars and paid to him, he would himself contribute to make up the necessary amount of the estimate and complete the repairs within three months thereafter. The Amildar supports the archak's prayer and states that the cultivators of the lands not having been recognised by Government as kadim tenants, it is not possible to ascertain from them what particular crop and how much was harvested every year, and recommends that only the arrears of kandayam which amount to Rs. 451-15-7 may be recovered from those from whom they are due. In this view, the Deputy Commissioner concurs.

6. The Deputy Commissioner's recommendation is approved. The arrears of kandayam up to the year Visvavasu which are stated to amount to Rs. 451-15-7 as well as that for the years Parabhava and Plavanga which remains still uncollected, should be recovered from the guttadars concerned, and credited to the funds of the institution, in view to the same being utilised for the repairs. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to have an estimate prepared for the repairs of the temples in question and submit it for the sanction of Government at an early date.

7. In para 5 of the Government Proceedings of the 23rd January 1906, the Deputy Commissioner was also requested to submit a scale of expenditure for the two temples in question, with a view to exercise proper check over the income and expenditure of the temple lands. A scale has been submitted by the Deputy Commissioner, who states that it has been prepared by the Amildar Mr. Dharma Rao after careful scrutiny and particularly with reference to the income from the inam. From the scale it is observed that against an income of Rs. 144-14-6 due to the temple per annum after payment of Government dues, an expenditure of Rs. 56-6-0 is proposed to be fixed for Nityakatle, Rs. 33-10-0 for Hetchukatle, Rs. 48-0-0 for pay of the archak of both the temples and Rs. 6-14-6 for annual repairs. The Deputy Commissioner is of opinion that the scale is reasonable and may be adopted.

8. Under the circumstances represented, the proposed scale which appears suitable is sanctioned. A statement of the scale as now sanctioned is appended hereto.

CSB 17/7

Muzrai Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, returning enclosures.

The Comptroller to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Exd.—C. P. S.

Muzrai, dated 17th June 1908.

Statement showing the sanctioned scale of expenditure in the Sri Venugopalaswami and Anjaneyaswami temples at Tayur.

Nitvakatle :—

	Rs.	a.	p
Rice for nivedana at half a seer per diem ...	21	10	0
Gingelly oil at one-fourth seer per diem ..	10	2	0
Cotton	1	8	0
Camphor	5	0	0
Incense	1	0	0
Sandal	0	10	0
Betel-leaves and nuts	3	12	0
Plantains	4	8	0
Flowers	1	8	0
Firewood	3	0	0
Ghee	3	12	0
Total ...	56	6	0

Hetchukatle :—

Tailamrita and Panchamrita Abhisheka on every Saturday	9	12	0
Krishna Jayanti	1	0	0
Hanuma Jayanti	0	8	0
Yugadi	0	8	0
Sri Ramanavami	0	8	0
Navaratri	2	8	0
H. H. the Maharaja's Birthday	0	8	0
Deeparadhane expenses in the month of Karteeka at 0-4-0 per diem	7	8	0
Yuvaraja's Birthday	0	8	0
Rathasaptami	0	8	0
Deepavali	0	8	0
Dakshinayana	0	8	0
Uttarayana	0	8	0
Dhanurmasa	3	12	0
Madhvanavami	0	10	0
One pair of dhotra	4	0	0
Total ...	33	10	0
Archak on Rs. 4 per month	48	0	0
Amount to be annually set apart for repairs ...	6	14	6
Grand Total ...	144	14	6